



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/605,473	10/01/2003	Allan McLane	718395.52	2472
27128	7590	04/28/2005	EXAMINER	
BLACKWELL SANDERS PEPER MARTIN LLP			FOX, JOHN C	
720 OLIVE STREET			ART UNIT	
SUITE 2400			PAPER NUMBER	
ST. LOUIS, MO 63101			3753	

DATE MAILED: 04/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

This action is responsive to the communication filed March 17, 2005.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 10-12, 40, 43-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gire et al.

Gire et al show a valve where the rotor is read as including a plurality of passages in that the common port at 1 is connected with a plurality of ports leading to 3a-d, 4a-d. The recitations of inlet and outlet in these claims merely relate to intended use and are given no weight.

Applicant's remarks have been fully considered but are not deemed to be persuasive. The various openings on the plug 5, at different levels along the plug, can reasonably be read as passages.

Claims 4-5, 22-23, 25, 41-42, 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gire et al in view of Flider.

Gire et al show the claimed device except for a bias. Flider shows a spring for biasing a valve rotor to one position. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a spring in the valve of Gire et al to bias the rotor to a desired position.

Claims 1 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ehrhardt.

Ehrhardt shows a rotary multiway valve which uses a stepper motor 24 to actuate, see column 2, line 55. The recitations of inlet and outlet in these claims merely relate to intended use and are given no weight.

The amendatory claim language fails to distinguish over Ehrhardt as well. A passage runs from 29a-29c and another passage runs from 29a-29b, and the first part of the passages are common.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehrhardt in view of Babin.

Ehrhardt shows the claimed valve except for reduction gearing, which Babin shows. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a reduction gearing as taught by Babin to increase the torque applied to the valve.

Claims 1, 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Muckler.

Muckler shows a rotary multiway valve with a T shaped passage. The recitations of inlet and outlet in these claims merely relate to intended use and are given no weight.

The recited structure can be readily found in Muckler in the same manner as previously explained.

Claims 1 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Snyder.

Snyder shows a rotary multiway valve where outer portion 70 is read as the larger axial passage. The recitations of inlet and outlet in these claims merely relate to intended use and are given no weight.

The recited structure can be readily found in Snyder in the same manner as previously explained.

Claims 1 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Simpson. Simpson shows a valve with passages 26 and 32 connected by 34, which passages are read as internal in that they are within the cylindrical outline of the rotor.

Claims 1, 19-20, 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ford et al.

Ford et al shows a rotary multiway valve where the rotor is spaced from the housing and the valve includes flexible seals. The recitations of inlet and outlet in these claims merely relate to intended use and are given no weight.

The recited structure can be readily found in Ford et al in the same manner as previously explained.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford et al in view of Koch et al.

Ford et al show the claimed valve except the seals are carried by the rotor. Koch et al shows a rotary multiway valve where the seals are carried by the housing. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have reversed the seals of Ford et al and carry the seals on the housing.

Claims 25, 28 and 49-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford et al in view of Flider. Ford et al show the claimed valve except for a biasing means. Flider shows a spring for biasing a valve rotor to one position. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a spring in the valve of Ford et al to bias the rotor to a desired position.

Claims 25-26, 36-39 and 52-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki et al in view of Spies et al and further in view of Flider.

Aoki et al show a rotary multiway valve for a cooling circuit with valve 262, which appears to have two axial passages leading to and from the tank 4 and 4 radial passages, see Figures 3 and 16 in particular. Spies et al show a rotary multiway valve in the same environment which is biased, and Flider shows a rotary valve with a spring biasing the rotor. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the Aoki et al valve with a spring bias in view of Spies et al and Flider.

Aoki et al also have two passages with a common portion, which meets the claim language.

Claims 29-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehmann in view of Inoue et al.

Lehman shows a rotary multiway valve as claimed except for the sensors. Inoue et al show a heater control valve with temperature and other sensors for controlling the valve through a processor. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to used such sensors in the system of Lehmann to similarly control the valve.

As to Lehmann, see the remarks above.

Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehmann in view of Inoue et al as applied above and further in view of Spies et al and Flider.

Spies et al show a rotary multiway valve in the same environment as Lehmann which is biased, and Flider shows a rotary valve with a spring biasing the rotor. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the Lehmann valve, as modified, with a spring bias in view of Spies et al and Flider.

Claims 40 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bondi.

Bondi shows a valve having plural connected flow passages and allows some flow between the rotor and body. The recitations of inlet and outlet merely related to intended use and are given no weight.

Claims 27 and 48 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 3753

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Fox whose telephone number is 571-272-4912. The examiner can normally be reached on Increased Flextime.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gene Mancene can be reached on 571-272-4930. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3753

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



John Fox
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3753